

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected to claims 5-9, 14-18, and 23-37 as indefinite (35 U.S.C. §112, par. 2) on the grounds that there was no antecedent basis for the third and fourth storage devices. Applicants amended claims 5, 14, and 23 to provide antecedent basis to overcome the rejection.

Applicant amended claim 22 to correct a typographical error noted by the Examiner.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-27 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Tanaka (U.S. Patent No. 5,542,064) in view of Arnon (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,796 B1). Applicants traverse these rejections for the following reasons.

Claims 1, 10, and 19 concern accessing a data set from one of two storage devices, each including a copy of the data set. These claims require: maintaining a flag for each storage device indicating whether a previous access attempt of the data set from the storage device failed; in response to an access request to the data set, selecting the storage device having the flag indicating that no previous access attempt failed if the flag for the other storage device indicates that one previous access attempt of the data set from the storage device failed; and accessing the data set from the selected storage device.

Applicants amended claims 1, 10, and 19 to further require that selecting the storage device having the flag indicating that no previous access attempt failed is performed in response to an access request to the data set. This added requirement is disclosed on at least pages 8-9 and FIG. 3.

The Examiner found that col. 7, lines 4-7 of Tanaka teaches the claim requirement of maintaining a flag for each storage device indicating whether a previous access attempt of the data set from the storage device failed. (Office Action, pg. 3). Applicants traverse.

The claims require that each of the two storage devices include a copy of the same data set, and that flags be maintained for each storage device indicating whether a previous access attempt to the data set failed. The independent claims 1, 10, and 19 further require that in response to an access request to the data set, the storage device having the flag indicating that no previous access attempt failed is selected if the flag for the other storage device indicates that one previous access attempt of the data set from the storage device failed

The cited col. 7 of Tanaka mentions that there is a flag for each disk indicating whether the disk drive can be used. Although Tanaka discusses the use of flags with disk drives indicating whether a drive failed, nowhere does the cited col. 7 of Tanaka teach or suggest the claim requirement that a flag is maintained for two storage devices that have the same data set and that in response to an access request, the storage device having the flag indicating that no previous access attempt failed is selected if the flag for the other storage device indicates that one previous attempt failed. Thus, the flag in Tanaka does not teach or suggest the particular flag used with storage devices and how that flag is used.

The Examiner cited col. 2, lines 56-60 of Tanaka as teaching the selecting limitation. (Office Action, pg. 3). The cited col. 2 mentions selecting store units that have less a degree of waiting to be subject to I/O commands to write identical data. Nowhere do the cited cols. 2 and 7 of Tanaka anywhere teach or suggest the claim requirement, that in response to an access request, a selection is made of one of two storage devices having the data set whose flag indicates that no previous access failed when the flag for the other storage device indicates that a previous access failed. Although the cited Tanaka mentions indicating whether a drive failed, nowhere do the cited cols. 2 and 7 anywhere teach or suggest that in response to receiving an access request, the flags are considered such that the storage device having a flag indicating no failure is selected when the other storage device flag indicates a failure.

For instance, col. 12, lines 40-50 of Tanaka discuss that when one disk drive fails, the data may be recovered from another disk drive. However, this cited section also nowhere teaches that the flags of Tanaka indicating drive failure are checked for two storage devices having the copy of the data to determine from which device to access the data.

The Examiner further cited col. 14, lines 19-26 of Arnon. The cited Arnon mentions flags for each storage device indicating the state of the device as on-line, off-line, or pending off-line. Nowhere does the cited Arnon teach or suggest that in response to receiving an access request, the flags are considered such that the storage device having a flag indicating no previous access failure is selected when the other storage device flag indicates a previous access failure.

Thus, although both Tanaka and Arnon mention flags with storage devices indicating a state of the storage device, such as failed, nowhere does the cited Tanaka nor Arnon teach or suggest, alone or in combination the use of such flags with storage devices having a copy of the same data set, and then considering such flags to select one storage device to use for the access. Thus, even if the references may be combined, they still do not teach or suggest all the claim requirements.

Accordingly, claims 1, 10, and 19 are patentable over the cited art because the cited art, alone and in combination, does not teach or suggest all the claim requirements.

Claims 2-9, 11-18, and 20-27 are patentable over the cited combination of art because they depend from claims 1, 10, and 19, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above, and because they add requirements that in combination with the base and intervening claims from which they depend, further distinguish over the cited combination. Moreover, claims 2, 4-9, 11, 13-18, 20, and 22-27 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 2, 11, and 20 depend from claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively, and further require using a selection criteria to access one of the first and second storage devices that is unrelated to a value of the flag if the flags for both storage devices have the same value. The Examiner cited col. 9, lines 47-48 of Tanaka as teaching the additional requirement of these claims. (Office Action, pg. 4). Applicants traverse.

The cited col. 9 mentions that if the number of selected disk drives cannot satisfy the multiplicity, then supplements are selected from disk drives having data satisfying the conditions. Tanaka mentions that the multiplicity is the number of instances of identical data, where the number of disk drives should be larger than the multiplicity. (Tanaka, col. 5, line 38 to col. 6, line 5)

Nowhere does the cited col. 9 anywhere teach or suggest a selection criteria to access a copy of a data set from one of two storage devices that is unrelated to the flag for each device indicating whether a previous access attempt to the device failed. Further, the cited col. 9 does not teach the claim requirement of selecting a device in response to an access request for a data

set having copies on two different storage device. Instead, the cited col. 9 concerns ensuring there are enough disk drives or other areas to write multiple instances of identical data. Nowhere does the cited col. 9 anywhere teach selecting one of two storage devices for an access based on the flag value and another selection criteria unrelated to the flag.

Accordingly, claims 2, 11, and 20 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the cited combination does not teach or suggest the additional claim requirements alone or in combination with base and any intervening claims.

Claims 4, 13, and 22 depend from claims 1, 10, and 19 and further require that a flag is maintained for each data set in the first and second storage devices and wherein the first and second storage devices have the same data sets.

Claims 4, 13, and 22 were amended to clarify that the flag for each data sets indicates whether a previous access to the data set failed.

The Examiner cited col. 2, lines 26-29 of Tanaka as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Office Action, pg. 4). Applicants traverse.

The cited col. 2 mentions writing identical data to enhance I/O throughput of a secondary storage device having a plurality of storage units. Nowhere does this cited col. 2 anywhere teach or suggest providing a flag for each data set in the first and second storage devices having the same data sets, where the flag for each data set indicates whether a previous access to the data set failed. Instead, the cited col. 2 just mentions how identical data can be copied to different units in a storage device.

Accordingly, claims 4, 13, and 22 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the cited combination does not teach or suggest the additional claim requirements alone or in combination with base and any intervening claims.

Claims 5, 14, and 23 depend from claims 1, 10, and 19 and further require: accessing the data set from one of a third and fourth storage devices if the data set is in one of the third and fourth storage devices, wherein the steps of selecting one of the first and second storage devices and accessing the data from one of the first and second storage devices occurs if the data set is not in one of the third and fourth storage devices; copying the data set from the first storage

device to the third storage device when accessing the data set from the first storage device; and copying the data set from the second storage device to the fourth storage device when accessing the data set from the first storage device.

The Examiner cited col. 13, lines 51-56 of Tanaka as teaching the additional requirements of claims 5, 14, and 23. (Office Action, pg. 4). Applicants traverse.

The cited col. 13 mentions that data to be recovered at time of recovery of a failure in any disk drive is obtained from identical data multiply copied in some disk drives so that the recovery can be written at any time. Nowhere does the cited col. 13 anywhere teach or suggest the claim requirement that a data set is copied from a first to third storage devices or from a second to fourth storage devices when the data is accessed from the first or second storage devices. Instead, the cited col. 13 just mentions that data may be recovered from one of multiple copies, and says nothing of the claim requirement of when data is copied over from one storage device to another as claimed.

Accordingly, claims 5, 14, and 23 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the cited combination does not teach or suggest the additional claim requirements alone or in combination with base and any intervening claims.

With respect to claims 6, 15, and 24, the Examiner cited col. 13, lines 48-56 as teaching the claim requirement of recalling the data set from the third storage device if the scheduled write operation has not yet copied the requested data set to the first storage device, wherein the steps of selecting one of the first and second storage devices to access the data set and accessing the data set occurs if the scheduled write operation of the data set to the first storage device completed. (Office Action, pg. 5) Applicants traverse.

The cited col. 13 mentions that keeping the CPU waiting for input commands through some disk drives can be eliminated to improve performance. Col. 13 further mentions that data to be recovered at time of recovery of a failure in any disk drive is obtained from identical data multiply copied in some disk drives so that the recovery can be written at any time. Nowhere does the cited col. 13 anywhere teach or suggest the claim requirement of recalling a data set from a third storage device if a scheduled write from the third to first storage device has not yet

copied data, and that selecting one of the first and second storage devices to access the data set occurs if the scheduled write has completed. Nowhere are these claimed sequence of events anywhere taught or remotely suggested in the cited col. 13.

Accordingly, claims 6, 15, and 24 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the cited combination does not teach or suggest the additional claim requirements alone or in combination with base and any intervening claims.

Claims 7, 16, and 25 depend from claims 6, 15, and 24 and further require randomly selecting one of the first and second storage devices from which to recall the data set if the requested data set has been copied to the first and second storage devices as a result of the scheduled write operation and if the flags for both storage devices have the same value.

Te Examiner cited col. 13, lines 48-56 of Tanaka as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Office Action, pg. 5) Applicants traverse.

As discussed, the cited col. 13 mentions that data to be recovered at time of recovery of a failure in any disk drive is obtained from identical data multiply copied in some disk drives so that the recovery can be written at any time.

Nowhere does this cited col. 13 anywhere teach or remotely suggest that one of the first and second storage devices is randomly selected for the recall if the requested data set has been copied to the first and second storage devices and if the flags (indicating whether a previous access failed) have the same value. Nowhere does the cited col. 13 anywhere suggest this sequence of operations and determinations, i.e., randomly select if requested data copied and if flags have the same value.

Accordingly, claims 7, 16, and 25 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the cited combination does not teach or suggest the additional claim requirements alone or in combination with base and any intervening claims.

Claims 8-9, 17-18, and 16-27 are patentable over the cited art because they depend directly or indirectly from claims 5, 14, and 23 and for the additional limitations these claims add, which in combination with the requirements of the base and intervening claims provide still further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Amdt. dated May 15, 2003
Reply to Office action of Jan. 15, 2003

Serial No. 09/436,506
Docket No. TU999036
Firm No. 0018.0059

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-27 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants submit herewith the fee for a one month extension of time. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0585.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: May 15, 2003

By: 

David W. Victor
Reg. No.: 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes Victor & Mann, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984